

**REMARKS**

The Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for thoroughly reviewing and considering the pending application. The Office Action dated May 31, 2006 has been received and carefully reviewed. Claims 1, 3-4, and 6 have been amended and claims 2 and 7 have been canceled. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-6 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention, as discussed in the Office Action. The Applicants have canceled claim 7, and request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-3 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,913,952 to *Kim* (hereinafter “*Kim*”). The Office Action also rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by KR 10-2001-0037081. The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. As stated above, claims 2 and 7 have been canceled thus the rejection of these claims are considered moot.

Regarding claims 1 and 3, the Applicants respectfully submit that *Kim* does not teach every element recited in these claims and, therefore, *Kim* cannot anticipate these claims. More specifically, claim 1 has been amended to recite a method of controlling a drum-type washing machine which includes “after the dewatering step is complete, disengaging a driving control of the motor, wherein the disengaged motor freewheels and slows to a stop” and “detecting a rotational speed of the motor as the motor freewheels and slows to stop and comparing the detected speed of the motor with a predetermined value.” *Kim* fails to disclose these features.

In addition to the amendments to the claims, it is further noted that *Kim* fails to teach or fairly suggest “detecting the rotational speed of the motor.” Rather, *Kim* discloses detecting the “rotating speed of the dehydrating vessel.” Detecting the rotating speed of the vessel is different from “detecting the rotational speed of the motor.” Second, *Kim* performs the detecting of the rotational speed of the vessel during the dewatering step (see column 4, lines 58-62) not “after the dewatering step is complete,” as required by claim 1.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over *Kim*, and request that the rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, claim 3, which depends from claim 1 is also patentable for at least the same reasons.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-3, 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,116,243 to *Khan et al.* (hereinafter “*Khan*”). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Again, it is noted that claims 2 and 7 have been canceled and thus the rejection of these claims is considered moot.

Regarding claims 1 and 3, the Applicants respectfully submit that *Khan* does not teach every element recited in claims 1 and 3 and therefore cannot anticipate these claims. More specifically, claim 1 has been amended to recite a method of controlling a drum-type washing machine which includes “after the dewatering step is complete, disengaging a driving control of the motor, wherein the disengaged motor freewheels and slows to a stop” and “detecting a rotational speed of the motor as the motor freewheels and slows to stop and comparing the detected speed of the motor with a predetermined value.” *Khan* fails to disclose these features.

Again, in addition to the amendments to the claims, it is noted that the Office Action alleges that since *Khan* discloses a method including “specific steps at specific rotational speeds it is inherent that the rotational speed is detected and compared to the needed value.” See page 3 of the Office Action. The Applicants respectfully disagree. First, the rotational speeds disclosed by *Khan* are the rotational speeds of the cylinder, not of the motor. Therefore, *Khan* cannot possibly teach “detecting a rotational speed of the motor as the motor freewheels and slows to stop and comparing the detected speed of the motor with a predetermined value.” Secondly, these rotational speeds of the cylinder are cycles during the dewatering step, they are not performed after the completion of the dewatering step, as required by claim 1.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over *Khan*, and request that the rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, claim 3, which depends from claim 1 is also patentable for at least the same reasons.

Regarding claim 6, claims 6 has been amended to recite the following feature “the force applied to the drum causes laundry attached to the inner surface of the drum to separate and fall away from the inner surface of the drum.” Applicants submit that *Khan* fails to teach or suggest this limitation. Rather, *Khan* teaches applying a water stream across the side wall of the drum to separate the laundry from the drum. See column 7, line 70 to column 8, line 8. Therefore, Applicants submit claim 6 is patentable over *Khan* and request the rejection be withdrawn..

The Office Action rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the ‘081 Application in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0046962 to *Sonoda et al.* (hereinafter “*Sonoda*”) and Japanese Patent 05-269292 (hereinafter “the ‘292 Patent”). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. As stated above, claim 2 has been canceled. Thus, the rejection of claim 2 is considered moot.

As required in Chapter 2143.03 of the M.P.E.P., in order to “establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.” The Applicants submit that neither the ‘081 Application, *Sonoda* nor the ‘292 Patent either singularly or in combination, teach or suggest each and every element recited in claims 1 and 3-5. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to recite a method of controlling a drum-type washing machine which includes “after the dewatering step is complete, disengaging a driving control of the motor, wherein the disengaged motor freewheels and slows to a stop” and “detecting a rotational speed of the motor as the motor freewheels and slows to stop and comparing the detected speed of the motor with a predetermined value.” None of the references either singularly or in combination, disclose this feature.

In addition to the amendments, it is noted that the Office Action admits that the ‘081 Application does not teach “detecting and comparing with a critical value a rotational speed of the motor after completion of the dewatering step.” Specifically, the Office Action alleges “‘081 does not teach the use of speed control to determine and prevent unbalanced rotation.” The Office Action deals with this deficiency by alleging that *Sonoda* and the ‘292 Patent teach that it was known to control the rotational speed of the motor and to determine and prevent unbalanced conditions. See pages 4-5 of the Office Action. Whether or not this is true, this is not what

claim 1 recites. While *Sonoda* and the '292 Patent may teach controlling the rotational speed of the drum, neither *Sonoda* nor '292 disclose "controlling the driving control of the motor to apply a force to the drum after the steps of detecting and comparing" wherein those steps are performed "after the dewatering step is complete" as required by claim 1. Specifically, *Sonoda* and the '292 Patent teach controlling the rotational speed of the drum during the dewatering step, not after the dewatering step.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the '081 Application in view of *Sonoda* and the '292 Patent and request that the rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, claims 3-5 which depend from claim 1 are also patentable for at least the same reason as discussed above.

The application is in a condition for allowance and favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner believes a conversation with the Applicant's representative would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

**Application No.: 10/720,682**  
**Amdt. After Final dated November 30, 2006**  
**Reply to Office Action dated May 31, 2006**

**Docket No.: 9988.088.00**

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: November 30, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By *M. Kresloff* Yong Cao  
Reg. No. 48,324  
**Mark R. Kresloff**

Registration No.: 42,766  
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorneys for Applicant